Remarks

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 21, 41 and 42 are independent.

Claims 1-42 have been rejected.

The Examiner has further objected to claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 41 for minor informalities. Accordingly, claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 41 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, Applicant submits that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

No new subject matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claim Rejections/ Arguments

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 10-28 and 30-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Jensen (US 2004/0261086) in view of Kiellberg and further in view of Krantz. Claims 9 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen in view of Mehta. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 as amended recites (Applicant's emphasis in underline): *A method for providing customized provisioning of an application on a runtime environment of a terminal, the application including content having at least one content type, the method comprising the steps of:*

> *obtaining the content by the runtime environment;*

> *for each content type, obtaining by the runtime environment <u>a set of provisioning instructions related to the content type, the provisioning instructions being customized for different subsets of versions of the application and being</u>*

9

coupled to the application for specifying a provisioning application program interface (API) set for provisioning the content on the terminal; and

executing by the runtime environment the provisioning instructions for employing the API set, by a script interpreter, to provision the application according to the specified content type.

As described in the specification of the subject application and as claimed in claim 1, each application includes a related set of provisioning instructions being coupled to the application. The set of provisioning instructions provides the ability for a corporation or a wireless carrier to customize how an application is provisioned **on a terminal**, such as a wireless client mobile device.

Having the provisioning instructions coupled to the application, as claimed, allows the same application to be provisioned differently on different terminals.

This concept is elaborated in detail on page 18, line 11 to page 20, line 2. Further, a concise description is provided in the example illustrated on page 27, line 8 to page 28, line 10 of the specification. In this example, a developer develops an application and provides a set of provisioning instructions accordingly. When the application is transferred to a carrier registry, so that it can be made available to client devices/ terminals, the carrier registry can include its own set of custom provisioning instructions. In the case of a corporate enterprise, the corporation can customize by including a further set of provisioning instructions.

Accordingly, it can be seen that even if two users have the exact same application executing on the exact same type of client mobile device, the application may be provisioned differently if the application version is for a different carrier registry and/or a different corporation.

In contrast, Jensen relates only to provisioning services on a server for transmission to a client terminal. All of the disclosure in Jensen relates

specifically to the server, including the provisioning application, the provisioning API and the adaptors. The teachings in Jensen end once the services have been transmitted to the client. That is, Jensen is silent with regard to the provisioning of the service at the client terminal.

There is nothing in Jensen, even at the server side, that can be considered the equivalent of the provisioning instructions where the provisioning instructions are customized for different users of the application. There is nothing in Jensen to suggest that a service is provisioned differently for different users. A given application in Jensen is provisioned the same way on all devices, which eliminates any possibility of customization related to a wireless carrier or an enterprise corporation.

Therefore, for at least the claim 1 features discussed above, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentable in view of Jensen, since neither Kiellberg nor Krantz discloses the features discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 21, 41 and 42 are similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore a similar argument applies. Accordingly, we submit that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Since the remaining dependent claims depend from one of the above noted independent claims, since we submit that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Ohab/

Henry Ohab
Registration No. 45,854
ph: (416) 862-3593

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario, M5X 1G5

TOR_LAW\7201009\1